Docket: 080404.49983US

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully

requested in view of the above amendments and the discussion below.

Applicants' invention, as defined by the method of independent Claim 1

and the apparatus of independent Claims 18 and 20, concerns an improvement

in the comfort of passengers in an airplane, and particularly those who are

positioned next to a window or "window section" of an airplane. The

improvement involves a coating material applied to the interior surface of the

airplane wherein this coating material has a low thermal emission coefficient

which provides reflection of heat from the inside environment. More

particularly, the heat of the passenger is reflected back to the passenger so that

the surface, with the coating, does not emit radiation primarily as a function of

its surface temperature.

Claims 1-4, 16-20 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as

anticipated by the reference to Yoneda et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,976,702, with an

indication being given that this reference discloses applying a heat-reflective

coating to an interior surface of a cabin of an aircraft as indicated at lines 19-24,

column 1. The coating was stated to be capable of direct radiation exchange with

a passenger.

- 3 -

Docket: 080404.49983US

Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 18 and 20

provide method steps and structure which are not available from the reference to

Yoneda et al.

The reference to Yoneda et al. concerns a composition for surface

treatment which improves the surface's ability to be cleaned. In other words, the

'702 reference provides a composition which allows the surface to have an

improved resistance to dust, soil and water or, alternatively, to allow such

material to be easily removed.

There is no indication that such a material has a low emission coefficient,

and furthermore there is no indication in Yoneda et al. that the coating is

applied to an interior surface of a cabin of a passenger airplane. The rejection

makes reference to lines 19-24 of column 1 for supporting the rejection.

However, this section indicates that the surface of an exterior part of

transportation equipment such as "automobiles, ships, or aircraft" is coated with

the material of the '702 reference.

Therefore, there is no indication that the coating material of the '702

reference is a low thermal emission coefficient material or that it is a heat-

reflecting coating or that it is applied to the interior surface of a cabin of a

passenger airplane or that it provides improved radiation exchange with a

passenger in the airplane cabin. Each of these features are a part of each of

independent Claims 1, 18 and 20.

- 4 -

Docket: 080404.49983US

Claims 1, 2, 7, 9 and 16-22 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102

as anticipated by the reference to Coleman, U.S. Patent No. 4,731,289, based on

a discussion at column 3, lines 60-62.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the grounds that the

reference to Coleman is concerned with applying a coating for plastics which is

abrasion resistant and that column 3, lines 60-62 indicates that the coated

polycarbonate sheet is useful as an aircraft window with polyurethane coating on

the inside surface. Obviously, the purpose of this structure at column 3, lines 60-

62, is to prevent scratching of the inside surface of the window. In contrast to

the presently claimed invention, the polyesterurethan material used as the

abrasive resistant coating in Coleman has an emission coefficient approximately

equal to one, whereas the present invention calls for a low thermal emission

coefficient.

The material disclosed in Coleman absorbs infrared radiation and does not

reflect infrared radiation as does the coating of the present invention. Therefore,

using such a material on the inside surface of the window will not provide the

claimed invention.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over

Yoneda et al. in view of Allemand et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,178,034, with Claims,

13, 14 and 15 being rejected over Yoneda et al., Allemand et al., and Fix et al.,

U.S. Patent No. 6,055,088. Claims 7 and 21 are rejected as obvious over the

- 5 -

reference to Yoneda et al., Claims 8 and 9 are rejected over Yoneda et al. in view

of Allemand et al., and Claims 10-12 are rejected over Yoneda et al. and Rensch,

U.S. Patent No. 6,092,915. Claim 8 is also rejected as unpatentable over

Coleman et al. '289.

Applicants respectfully submit that the additional references add nothing

toward meeting the claim limitations of the independent Claims 1, 18 and 20,

from which each of the dependent Claims 2-17, 19, 21 and 22 depend from and

contain the limitations thereof.

Applicants' amendments to Claim 1 have been made in order to address

the Examiner's indication in the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 that

the claim was indefinite because of the phrase "capable of direct radiation

exchange." Although Applicants do not agree with this assertion, an amendment

to Claim 1 now recites that the coating provides improved radiation exchange

with a passenger in the airplane cabin. This language is sufficient to meet the

requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and does not affect the scope of the claimed

protection.

Therefore, in view of the distinguishing features between the claimed

invention and the references, which features are not shown or disclosed or made

obvious by the references or their combination, Applicants respectfully request

that this application containing Claims 1-22 be allowed and be passed to issue.

- 6 -

Docket: 080404.49983US

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket No. 080404.49983US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 6, 2003

Vincent V. Sunderdick Registration No. 29,004

CROWELL & MORING, L.L.P. P.O. Box 14300

Washington, DC 20044-4300

Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500

Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844

VJS/lw



Serial No.: 09/874,371 Docket: 080404.49983US

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

Please AMEND Claims 1, 18 and 20 as follows:

1. (AMENDED) A method of improving thermal comfort in a ger airplane, the airplane in the cabin for transporting one or more passengers, the mean applying a heat-reflecting coating with a low thermal emission coefficient surface of a cabin of a passenger airplane, passenger airplane, the airplane having a cabin with interior surfaces, the airplane cabin for transporting one or more passengers, the method comprising:

to at least one interior surface of a cabin of a passenger airplane,

exchange with a passenger in the airplane cabin.

18. (AMENDED) An airplane improved for thermal comfort, the improved airplane comprising:

an airplane comprising an airplane cabin having interior surfaces,

a heat-reflecting coating with a low thermal emission coefficient on at least one of the interior surfaces,

whereby the coating is [capable of a direct] provides improved radiation exchange with a passenger in the airplane cabin.

20. (AMENDED) An airplane cabin part improved for thermal comfort, the improved part comprising:

Docket: 080404.49983US

a part for use in an airplane cabin having at least one surface which, when the part is installed in the airplane cabin, provides the at least one interior surfaces of the airplane cabin,

a heat-reflecting coating with a low thermal emission coefficient applied to the surface,

whereby the coated surface, when the part is installed in the airplane cabin, [could have a direct] <u>provides improved</u> radiation exchange with a passenger.